

## **REMARKS**

Initially, in the Office Action the Examiner has rejected claims 1, 4-6, 8, 9, 11-16, 19-21, 23, 24, 26-30 and 32-36 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0054333 (Johnson) in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,050,551 (Beith et al.). Claims 7, 10, 22, 25, 31 and 37 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnson in view of Beith et al. and U.S. Patent No. 5,689,547 (Molne).

Claims 1, 4-16 and 19-37 remain pending in the present application.

### **Response to Arguments**

The Examiner states that Applicant's previous arguments are not persuasive. The Examiner asserts that Johnson discloses prompting a user of the mobile phone for a method of delivery of the requested phone number, in paragraphs 0024, 0025. However, Johnson merely discloses (as the Examiner states) a server prompting the user whether he wants to download the destination party's information. This occurs after the server has already sent and displayed the destination party's phone number to the user (see, Johnson paragraph 23). Johnson does not disclose or suggest prompting a user of the mobile phone for a method of delivery of the requested phone number, as recited in the claims of the present application. Johnson discloses sending the phone number then prompting the user for downloading information related to the destination party.

Moreover, the prompting for downloading the information is not prompting for a method of delivery of a phone number, as recited in the claims of the present application. The prompting disclosed in Johnson has nothing to do with a method of delivering a phone number.

### 35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

Claims 1, 4-6, 8, 9, 11-16, 19-21, 23, 24, 26-30 and 32-36 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnson and Beith et al.

Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Regarding claims 1, 11, 16, 26 and 32, Applicant submits that none of the cited references disclose, suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of each of these claims of the present application. For example, Applicant submits that none of the cited references disclose or suggest prompting a user of the mobile phone for a method of delivery of the requested phone number. As noted previously, the Examiner asserts that Johnson discloses prompting a user of the mobile phone for a method of delivery of the requested phone number, in paragraphs 0024, 0025.

However, as noted previously, Johnson merely discloses (as the Examiner states) a server prompting the user whether he wants to download the destination party's information. This occurs after the server has already sent and displayed the destination party's phone number to the user (see, Johnson paragraph 23). Johnson does not disclose or suggest prompting a user of the mobile phone for a method of delivery of the requested phone number, as recited in the claims of the present application. Johnson discloses sending the phone number then prompting the user for downloading information related to the destination party.

Moreover, the prompting for downloading the information is not prompting for a method of delivery of a phone number, as recited in the claims of the present application. The prompting disclosed in Johnson has nothing to do with a method of delivering a phone number. Applicant submits that none of the cited references disclose or suggest selecting a method of delivery for the requested number by the user. These limitations are neither disclosed nor suggested by the cited references.

Moreover, Applicant submits that none of the cited references disclose or suggest detecting that a number of the called information service is stored in a predetermined table of information service numbers, or activating a process for detecting and storing a received phone number responsive to the detecting the number of the called information service being stored in the predetermined table of information service numbers. The Examiner admits that Johnson does not disclose or suggest

these limitations but asserts that these limitations would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art by the disclosure of Johnson in paragraphs 31 and 32. However, as noted in Applicant's previous response, these portions merely relate to a user requesting a direction set (e.g., if lost), call an assistance service, and receive the directions by download and store them in a directory. This is not detecting that a number of the called information service is stored in a predetermined table of information service numbers, or activating a process for detecting and storing a received phone number responsive to the detecting the number of the called information service being stored in the predetermined table of information service numbers, as recited in the claims of the present application. The disclosure of requesting, download and storing of directions in Johnson would not render these limitations obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

Regarding claims 4-6, 8, 9, 12-15, 19-21, 23, 24, 27-30 and 33-36, Applicant submits that these claims are dependent on one of independent claims 1, 11, 16, 26 and 32 and, therefore, are patentable at least for the same reasons noted previously regarding these independent claims.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that Johnson does not disclose or suggest the limitations in the combination of each of claims 1, 4-6, 8, 9, 11-16, 19-21, 23, 24, 26-30 and 32-36 of the present application. Applicant respectfully requests that these rejections be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

Claims 7, 10, 22, 25, 31 and 37 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnson in view of Beith et al. and Molne. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Applicant submits that claims 7, 10, 22, 25, 31 and 37 are dependent on one of independent claims 1, 16, 26 and 32 and, therefore, are patentable at least for the same reasons noted previously regarding these independent claims.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose, suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of each of claims 7, 10, 22, 25, 31 and 37 of the present application. Applicant respectfully requests that these rejections be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that claims 1, 4-16 and 19-37 are now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, early allowance of such claims is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions about the present amendment or anticipates finally rejecting any claim of the present application, a telephone interview is requested.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 13-4365.

Respectfully submitted,

Thomas David Snyder  
(Applicant)



Date: June 1, 2009

Frederick D. Bailey  
Registration No. 42,282  
Moore & Van Allen PLLC  
P.O. Box 13706  
Research Triangle Park, N.C. 27709  
Telephone: (919) 286-8000  
Facsimile: (919) 286-8199